

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached three drawing sheets include changes to Figures 9, 10 and 11. These three drawing sheets replace the original three drawing sheets that included Figures 9, 10 and 11.

In Figure 9, the number "1" has been deleted from the label "Base Station 1" and the number "2" has been deleted from the label "Base Station 2".

In Figure 10, the number "1" has been deleted from the label "Base Station 1" and the number "2" has been deleted from the label "Base Station 2".

In Figure 11, the lead arrow corresponding to reference number "1100" has been deleted and a new lead arrow has been added.

Attachment: 3 Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 stand rejected. Claims 1-22 are pending in the patent application, but Claims 11-22 have been withdrawn from consideration. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below. Applicants believe that the amendments herein to the patent application do not add new matter to it.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Agrawal et al., US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0193114 (hereinafter Agrawal).

CLAIM 1

Applicants respectfully contend that Agrawal fails to teach subject matter as recited within amended independent Claim 1. For instance, amended Claim 1 recites in part (emphasis added):

b) sending a first multiple description bitstream from said first base station to said mobile client and sending a second multiple description bitstream from said second base station to said mobile client.

Applicants respectfully assert that Agrawal does not teach the first multiple description bitstream and the second multiple description bitstream as specifically recited in amended Claim 1 and described by the patent application (e.g., see page 10, line 15 – page 12, line 7). Instead, Applicants understand Agrawal to teach at paragraph 81 that "when the mobile station moves across IP Subnets, multiple copies of the same data are to be sent via multiple base stations to the mobile station (that is, Packet A and Packet B must be identical)." Since Agrawal fails to teach at least one element recited

in amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully contend that Agrawal cannot anticipate amended Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 is allowable over Agrawal.

CLAIM 6

Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 6 is allowable over Agrawal based on rationale similar to that described above with reference to amended independent Claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of rejected Claims 1-10.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Dated: July 8, 2005



Thomas M. Catale
Registration No.: 46,434

Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP
Two North Market St., Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

(408) 938-9060
Facsimile: (408) 938-9069